

# RADIO TV REPORTS, INC.

4701 WILLARD AVENUE, CHEVY CHASE, MARYLAND 20015 656-4068

---

FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

PROGRAM Face the Nation STATION WDVM-TV  
CBS Network

DATE March 28, 1982 11:30 A.M. CITY Washington, D.C.

SUBJECT Senator Barry Goldwater

GEORGE HERMAN: Senator Goldwater, the people of El Salvador are voting today, with the possibility of a victory by the extreme right. What do you feel should be the United States policy towards whoever wins the election in El Salvador?

SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER: I think we ought to try to get along with them. I think we should do whatever we can in a noncombatant way to help the country. Central America is as important to us, I think, as any part of the world, probably. And I wouldn't want to see us go down there with armed forces if there's a chance of getting the whole thing to work. And I think maybe we can do it.

ANNOUNCER: From CBS News, Washington, a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview on Face the Nation with Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona, Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee.

Senator Goldwater will be questioned by CBS News congressional correspondent Phil Jones; by Jack Germond, syndicated columnist for the Baltimore Evening Sun; and by the moderator, CBS News correspondent George Herman.

\*

\*

\*

HERMAN: Senator Goldwater, it was your opinion in your first answer that we should get along with whoever wins the election in El Salvador. But supposing it should turn out to be the extreme right wing, Major D'Aubuisson, who says his first action would be to hang President Duarte, a man who's been -- D'Aubuisson has been called a psychopathic butcher. Should we get along with him, or should we put him in some kind of quarantine?

---

OFFICES IN: WASHINGTON D.C. • NEW YORK • LOS ANGELES • CHICAGO • DETROIT • AND OTHER PRINCIPAL CITIES

Material supplied by Radio TV Reports, Inc. may be used for file and reference purposes only. It may not be reproduced, sold or publicly demonstrated or exhibited.

SENATOR GOLDWATER: I think we have to wait and see. But we have to get to the deeper part of this whole problem.

HERMAN: Very well.

SENATOR GOLDWATER: El Salvador is just a little part of it. We have to get at the fact that Cuba is now supplying Nicaragua with armament, and Nicaragua is supplying El Salvador with arms. Now, we have to stop Cuba in her intervention throughout Central America, and eventually South America.

How to do it? I've advocated -- and I know it won't be popular -- tell Castro that if he doesn't stop it, we'll start shooting down his supply planes and we'll start sinking his supply ships. That's going to be the real problem in that whole part of the world. Not just El Salvador and who wins the election or what's going on in Nicaragua, but what Castro is doing. And that's the serious part.

JACK GERMOND: Senator, in your first answer, you said we should do what we could to get along in a noncombatant way. Are there any circumstances under which we should send troops into El Salvador?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: I can't conceive of any at this moment. I don't think it would ever amount to another Vietnam, because we happen to have different leadership in Washington now than we had in the Vietnam days. And if any decision was made to use our military down there, it would be accompanied by a decision to win whatever we set out to do. But I just -- I'm just opposed to sending our troops down there. I think it can be worked out by conferring with Mexico -- I think they have a good idea there -- by talking to our friends that we have in that part of the world, and taking care of Castro and Cuba. That's going to be a real thorn in the side of free countries all over this hemisphere.

PHIL JONES: Senator Goldwater, you said earlier that we should tell Castro if he doesn't stop supplying arms to Nicaragua, we're going to start shooting down his supply flights.

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Yes.

JONES: Now, that's tough talk. But what about tough talk to the Russians, that are sending supply planes into Cuba that bring this equipment on its first leg? Should we be doing anything to Russia?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: I'm not worried about Russia and what she would do in this case. I think if we ever took action to stop Cuba, Russia would back away from Cuba. Russia, in my opinion, is not looking for a war. If Russia were looking for

a war, she could blackmail us any day she wants to, because she has far superior armed forces than we have. And I don't think she wants to go to war, particularly with us. She never has and I don't think she ever will.

JONES: Well, let me follow up on that. Just in the last day or so, a senior Soviet general has indicated that if the United States puts new nuclear weapons into Europe, that this may bring a new nuclear threat closer to the United States. Now, the implication of that is that they would have nuclear weapons in Cuba. At the same time, you're saying the Russians don't want war.

I don't see how these two things play.

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Well, that statement has been made, or a statement like it, so many times in the past 30 years or since World War II by top-ranking generals of Russia that I don't pay any attention to them. I look on Russia as being interested in Russia. And as far as pushing communism, there's no monolithic structure of communism in this world. Every country that has communism has a little different concept of it.

So, Russia has no real interest in Cuba other than using Cuba to infiltrate the other countries. There's no question of what Russia's ultimate aim is, and that's world domination. But I don't think now is the time that she feels it's ready.

HERMAN: Do we know that there are -- do we know, one way or another, that there are or are not any Soviet nuclear weapons in Cuba?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: No, I can't tell you that we do. And I'm not trying to duck any highly classified information. If they're there, they were never removed after the incident during President Kennedy's presidency.

HERMAN: So what you're saying by that, I take it, is that we know no new weapons have been flown in or brought in on ships.

SENATOR GOLDWATER: I think we're safe in saying that.

JONES: But they do have the facilities. Since 1962 and that crisis, isn't it correct that the Cubans have built a number of facilities that would take care of nuclear weapons if the Russians wanted to send them in?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Well, you have to keep in mind that using a nuclear weapon against the United States from Cuba doesn't take much of a weapon. It only has to travel 90 miles. It only has to travel about 1800 to hit the big cities of the

United States. And that's a very medium- or small-range missile. It can be launched from a mobile unit. It doesn't take holes in the ground or anything like that.

Now, whether Russia removed those missiles in '62, I'm not sure that we've ever been sure that they did it.

GERMOND: Senator, let me ask you about a different aspect of this. One thing that's apparent in public opinion polls and otherwise, through demonstrations and votes in town meetings in New Hampshire and places like that, is that there's a great deal of concern in this country right now, popular concern, about the Administration's attitude in Central America and toward the communists or our adversaries in general. Is this change in public opinion or this fear in the public a product of some real change? Are the Russians becoming more militant and aggressive? Or is it that this Administration is responding in a different way and hyping these fears?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: No. I think it's pretty much a normal reaction of the American people against nuclear weapons. I don't think they're opposed to conventional weapons. And I think we can understand the opposition to nuclear. The average American thinks of nuclear as that great bomb exploding out in the Pacific or over in Japan. We have a lot of opposition in this country to the manufacturing of electricity by nuclear force, and yet it's the only way we can produce electricity.

I can understand these people. Frankly, I'm not too strong on building MX's or adding to our arsenal. We have enough warheads now to do all the damage that has to be done. They have all the warheads they need. I, personally, wish there were some way we could sit down with the Soviets and say, "Look, this is rather silly. Neither one of us will use these weapons, in all probability. Why don't we get together and instead of talking about limiting our future manufacture, let's talk about eliminating those that we've already manufactured?" I would be in favor of that, and also in favor of going farther than that and having a multilateral understanding with the countries of the world, not just as to the production of nuclear weapons, but to the production of all weapons.

GERMOND: Are you satisfied that the Administration is interested in achieving the kind of goals you were just talking about?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Yes, I'm convinced of that.

GERMOND: Why isn't the public convinced of it? Why don't people have that feeling?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Well, there's still a little feeling in this country about Vietnam, understandably. Vietnam was a

badly run war by President Johnson, President Kennedy. It was a disgrace to America to lose the war like that. And many young people, the ages that would have to go to war, just don't like it.

I think the American people would respond if we got into the trouble that they understood, and they would be willing to take the risks. But I don't want to see us get in the position where we have to take those risks. And I think we can't handle it.

We can't handle it if we have great businesses like the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturing saying, "Let's cut defense." I happen to be on those committees and I can tell you we can cut a little bit, but we can't cut a lot.

HERMAN: Let me try something on you that I think we've been dancing around a little bit here. After carefully studying our polls and other people's public opinion polls about the President and foreign policy, I think one could make a case that the American people, or a large percentage of them, are worried about President Reagan and Secretary Haig being a little hasty, being a little apt to shoot from the hip. They do not have quite the confidence they've had in other Presidents that these gentlemen will act with the sobriety, the care, the caution that other Presidents may act.

SENATOR GOLDWATER: I think if you got out in the country and talked to the people, you wouldn't find this to be as true as you would believe it to be if you read just the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the big newspapers in this country.

Alex Haig is a rather quick-spoken man. He was a four-star general. And when he says "right face," that's just exactly what he means.

Now, I know President Reagan as well as anybody in this town, and he's not a warlike man. He's a peaceful man.

But you have to keep in mind that we've had a succession of Presidents that didn't understand war, that didn't understand the foreign policy necessary to prevent war. For 20 years, we have allowed our military to go down, down, down. So when we start talking about building up a military strength, not necessarily to equal the Russians, but to be able to talk with her, which is the basic necessity of foreign policy, Americans are understandably concerned.

I think I can give you one little bit of good news on that and the American people. The old infantry journal, the infantry manual, 100-15, which everybody studied since, I guess, the days of Washington, is being rewritten. And a salient point

in it is that the American people have to be told of every move we make in the military fields, the diplomatic fields, foreign policy fields, so the American people will understand what's going on and not have to read a newspaper that necessarily or necessarily is biased, or watch a television show where the same thing might occur.

JONES: Well, on that very line of keeping people informed, do you feel that you, as Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, have been kept informed by this Administration on all aspects of Central America?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Yes, I do.

JONES: Isn't it a fact, though, that you read in the newspaper about the covert operations that we had going in Nicaragua?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: No, that's...

JONES: ...the first you learned about it?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: That's not exactly the way it happened. Ben Bradlee, the Editor of the Washington Post, who is a good friend of mine, called me one day to ask some questions. And he hadn't spoken 10 seconds worth of words, and I said, "This man knows everything we heard in the meeting yesterday." And I said, "Well, Ben, I can't talk about that, but I'd suggest you talk with Mr. Casey." Which he did. And then the story came out by Mr. Woodward covering everything that we had talked about.

However, I didn't see or know of anything in that briefing that I didn't think the American people should know.

JONES: So, you're fully satisfied with the quantity and quality of information that your committee is receiving from the CIA and other intelligence...

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Yes, I am. There may be a case here and there where we don't get every last word. But it's not the fault of the CIA, nor the fault of our committee. We ask questions. And Mr. Casey and Admiral Inman and the rest of the intelligence family have been meticulous in answering what we want to know.

Now, there's a lot of things that we hear that we don't want to have get out. But this town has more leaks in it -- and I'm not going to tell you the place I have in mind. But everything we hear, practically, on that committee we know is going to turn up in the New York Times or the Washington Post. And I don't like that. I think that's a bad way to try to run foreign policy.

JONES: Are you keeping all of the members of the committee informed on everything that you know?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Under the rules that established this committee, the Vice Chairman, who is always a member of the other party -- in this case, Senator Moynihan -- and the Chairman have to hear some things that the other members of the committee are not allowed to hear. I think that's happened -- in my nearly two years as Chairman, it's happened twice. And then in a subsequent meeting, they were briefed.

JONES: Because your colleagues are not trustworthy? Is that...

SENATOR GOLDWATER: No, no. No.

JONES: Why can't they share this information?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: We now have -- because we have a committee in both houses, we have about 200 people that are privy to top secret. Now, I have to thank God that we haven't had more leaks out of those committees. I am very favorably inclined towards having a joint committee, where we reduce the number of senators and congressmen and reduce the number of 200 down to maybe 20 or 25. But we've been -- we've been pretty good about it.

GERMOND: Senator, let me ask you about a different subject. It is apparent now that President Reagan's budget, as now written, is not going to be approved in Congress. You just said a moment ago that you could see room for only modest reductions in defense spending.

SENATOR GOLDWATER: That's right.

GERMOND: That being the case, how can the budget be altered to make it acceptable to -- even to you Republicans in the Senate?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: I think there's one thing you have to keep in mind. There's 70 percent of our budget that the President has nothing to do with. And the only way the Congress can have anything to do with it is to have enough courage to rescind laws that created agencies that spend this money under no control other than a law saying that the Congress is going to control.

Now, where the President can act and hasn't acted is in a very, very dangerous, to my mind, and touchy field. The welfare business of this country has gone up over 200 percent in the last several years, and military spending's gone up, oh, maybe 10 percent. But when you get fooling around with the person on welfare, on food stamps, Social Security, which is your

money and my money. It's not the Federal Government. And I think there's been a lot of dishonesty throughout the years in handling Social Security funds -- but when you get tinkering with that objective, to reduce the welfare cost, how long is it going to be before you might even have anarchy in this country?

GERMOND: You're talking about -- we're talking about deficits, though, in fiscal '83...

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Yes.

GERMOND: ...that could go up to \$130 billion, which is the internal White House figure, assuming that some of these proposals are not approved. You have been, like every other Republican, very critical of deficits and very supportive of balanced budgets throughout your career. You can't cut 130 billion, or anything like it, out of welfare costs. Where do you make the cuts? Taxes?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Well, you're not going to get rid of this deficit.

GERMOND: What's an acceptable deficit, though?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Nothing is acceptable to me. But you have to keep in mind that we've had 40 years of Democratic spending, and that's why we have this deficit. Reagan didn't accumulate this deficit, by any means. It's been coming on, coming on, coming on all these years, I'll say through Democrats and Republican Presidents.

JONES: Well, but several of his programs are responsible for part of this deficit.

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Well, the tax cuts might be. But on the other hand, if you don't cut taxes, you don't give the economy an incentive to increase, if you don't increase the economy's ability to produce you don't create new jobs. So it's about six of one and a half dozen of another, and the devil on both your houses.

JONES: Well, fine tuning. Do we need a little fine tuning at this point, though? Perhaps look at that third year of the Reagan tax cut and some other changes?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: Oh, I don't think it would hurt to look at it. I think it would be a dreadful mistake to not grant these tax cuts. I feel very strongly that we are already on the upgrade in this country. We've just about gotten inflation back to normal.

JONES: So you don't want it repealed, in other words.



SENATOR GOLDWATER: Pardon?

JONES: The third year, you don't want it repealed.

SENATOR GOLDWATER: No. Wait. The third year, yes, I want to go through with the tax program that was enacted. I don't think it would serve any purpose to deny the American people the tax cut we've given them, because we have to create a rebirth of our free enterprise, marketplace economy. We can no longer play around with socialism or nationalism, which many members of Congress are prone to do. This country became a great economic power because we could work the way we want to, make the money we could make, and so forth. I want to get back to that, and that's the Reagan plan. And I think any deviation from that plan can really bring disaster.

GERMOND: Some of your colleagues, Republican colleagues in the Senate think you've already got a disaster in the condition of the economy and the reaction that's showing up in opinion polls. In fact, some of them even think that it's possible you might lose control of the Senate this year, though that seems a little far-fetched.

Aren't you worried about the political consequences?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: No. There's a lot of people running for reelection. And when you're up for reelection, anybody that says something to you that's unhappy, you're all with him.

I want to see the Republican Party stay hitched to the President. He's the first President we've had in many, many, many years that makes sense to the American people.

GERMOND: But he's developing an image as being unfair to the poor, of polarizing black Americans, of being too hard-line. Isn't that a thing that bothers you?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: That doesn't bother me because it's not true. If you don't have good big business in this country, you don't have good business any place. If you don't have full employment of whites, you don't have full employment or even partial employment of blacks.

HERMAN: But getting back to the Senate, Senator Goldwater, is the Republican Party hitched to the President when it goes off on the social programs, abortion, busing, things of that sort?

SENATOR GOLDWATER: I don't think they're hitched to him when they try to get around and pass social programs by circumventing the Constitution. That is not a conservative position. It's not a Republican position. It sounds more to me like some-